

*REMARKS/ARGUMENTS*

In response to the Office Action mailed December 20, 2007, Applicants amend their application and request continued Examination. No claims are added or cancelled in this Amendment so that claims 20-28 remain pending.

Claims 23-28 are allowed.

As described in the previous Response, claim 20 corresponds to former claim 2 that was prosecuted earlier in this patent application. In this Amendment, claim 20 is amended in the same way that former claim 1, the parent of former claim 2 and, therefore, part of claim 2, was amended in the Response to the Office Action mailed November 8, 2006. That Response was filed March 5, 2007. Thus, the amendment made here, identical to the amendment previously made without objection, finds support in the original application as filed. As described in the Amendment filed March 5, 2007, at page 7, support for the amendment appears within the specification at page 21, line 16 through page 22, line 1. Further description of the support for the amendment appears in that previous Amendment at pages 7 and 8.

The amendment previously made was in response to a rejection of former claims 1 and 2 as anticipated by Xu (U.S. Patent 5,552,977). In the Office Action mailed December 20, 2007, claims 20-22 were rejected as anticipated by Xu.

In the Response filed March 5, 2007, at pages 8 and 9, the basis of distinction from Xu, based upon the previously made amendment that is again made here, was presented. Those arguments are incorporated here by reference without again being set forth at length.

In reply to the Amendment filed March 5, 2007, in the Office Action mailed April 10, 2007, the Examiner withdrew the rejection of claim 2 and indicated that that claim was allowable if rewritten in independent form. For that reason, it is submitted that claim 20, as supplied here, is again distinguishable from and patentable over Xu. Accordingly, there is no further comment concerning the rejection of claims 20-22 as

anticipated by Xu. The previous prosecution demonstrates that the rejection should again be withdrawn based upon the foregoing Amendment.


Claims 20-22 were also rejected as anticipated by Ho (U.S. Patent 6,819,078). This rejection is respectfully traversed, particularly with respect to claims 20-22 as presented here.

As an initial point, Ho is almost impenetrable with respect to its brief disclosure which fails to explain in reasonable detail what is illustrated in the practically illegible figures of that patent. Accordingly, this Response is based upon the best understanding that could be gleaned from that disclosure.

Figure 5 of Ho, like Figure 8 of Xu, seems to describe determining whether a zero vector duration is shorter than zero, i.e., whether the duration is negative. By contrast, in the invention, particularly as defined by amended claim 20, the durations of the output of the voltage vectors are adjusted based upon whether the total of the durations of outputting of the zero voltage vectors, in the control cycle, is longer than a predetermined time that is longer than zero. Thus, the arguments previously presented in distinguishing the invention, as defined by former claim 2 and incorporated by reference from a previous response, are equally applicable in distinguishing the invention as defined by amended claim 20 from Ho. Therefore, further and detailed description of the distinctions is not necessary to demonstrate the invention as defined by amended claims 20-22 is not anticipated by Ho.

Reconsideration and allowance of claims 20-22, in addition to the previous allowance of claims 23-28, are earnestly solicited.

Respectfully submitted,



Jeffrey A. Wyand, Reg. No. 29,458  
LEYDIG, VOIT & MAYER  
700 Thirteenth Street, N.W., Suite 300  
Washington, DC 20005-3960  
(202) 737-6770 (telephone)  
(202) 737-6776 (facsimile)

Date: February 20, 2008  
JAW:ves